REMARKS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Freedman in view of Fernandes. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Freedman teaches away from a system including a control processor and multiple controlled processors because Freedman says it lacks fault tolerance. See Col 1, Lines 48-50. Freedman advocates instead that tasks be scheduled by individual processors. See Col 2, Line 51 to Col 3, Line 4. Therefore, Freedman is ineffective as a prior art reference to establish a rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

Applicant has added new claims 6-13. Neither Freedman nor Fernandes disclose processing of bulk customer history data as claimed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1-13 be allowed.

Paul W. Martin
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (937) 445-2990

Dayton, OH

MAR - 5 2004